

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

AUGUSTA DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

BYRON D. GRIFFIN

CR 107-105

---

**ORDER**

---

After a careful, *de novo* review of the file, the Court concurs with the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, to which no objections have been filed.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the Court. Therefore, Mr. Brown shall be reimbursed for a total amount of **\$4,630.41** for his Criminal Justice Act appointment in the above-captioned case.

SO ORDERED this 17 day of September, 2008.



HONORABLE LISA GODBEY WOOD  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup>Mr. Brown filed a Response to the Report and Recommendation, but he specifically stated that his "filing is not intended as an objection" and that he "is not seeking compensation or expenses above the amount currently recommended by the Court in this case." (Doc. no. 105, p. 1). Rather, Mr. Brown's Response was filed to clarify certain time entries on his voucher which the Magistrate Judge interpreted as double billing. The entries in question appeared on the voucher in the above-captioned case and in United States v. Griffin, CR 107-165 (S.D. Ga. Dec. 13, 2007), with activity descriptions suggesting they applied only to CR 107-165 or had otherwise been identically listed in both cases. In his Response, Mr. Brown explains that he actually split his time evenly between the two cases but did not concomitantly adjust the activity descriptions in the respective cases. Although the Court accepts Mr. Brown's explanation, there will be no change in amount of reimbursement recommended by the Magistrate Judge.